



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/383,742	08/26/1999	RABINDRANATH DUTTA	AT9-99-310	6984
35525	7590	04/13/2004	EXAMINER	
DUKE W. YEE CARSTENS, YEE & CAHOON, L.L.P. P.O. BOX 802334 DALLAS, TX 75380			EDOUARD, PATRICK NESTOR	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		2654
DATE MAILED: 04/13/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/383,742	DUTTA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Patrick N. Edouard	2654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 October 2003.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-28 and 31-38 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-28 and 31-38 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to communication filed 10/20/03 (paper #8). Claims 1-28 and 31-38 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1- 28 and 31-38 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2 and 7-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al (Transcoding Internet Content for Heterogeneous Client Devices) in view of Motoyama(5,848,386).

As per claim 1, Smith et al teach a trasncoder processing system implemented method for converting documents based on semantic characteristics, comprising (figure 1, his Internet content Transcoding system, pages III-599 to III-602):

"Receiving a request for a document client"(his client device, page III-599, section 2, His Internet content transcoder, a policy engine gathers the capabilities of the client, the networks conditions and the Transcoding preference of the user and publisher)'

"Passing the request to an origin server"(the request from the client server is passed to the publisher (server));

"Performing a syntactical Transcoding on the request document wherein at least one semantic at least one semantic characteristic of the request document is converted"(figure 1, his Internet content transcoder, Section 2, page III-599, the system selects the outputting versions of the contents and uses a library of content analysis, filtering translation and manipulation routines to generate the content to be delivered to the client); and

"Sending the requested document: to the client"(the system is able to retrieve the Internet content, analyze and transcode it and deliver it to the client, III-599 -III-600).

It is noted that Smith teaches the claimed invention but does not explicitly teach determining information regarding each semantic characteristic of a requested document wherein the information regarding each semantic characteristic is contained with a semantic tag in the requested document. However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by Motoyama et al who teach a system for translating a document form a first language to another language using different translation resources depending on the document portion being translated wherein each portion is tagged using a semantic tag at the abstract, figure 7 and col. 8, lines 60 to col. 9, line

15. Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to incorporate into the Transcoding system of Smith the semantic tag using different translation resources as taught by Motoyama because it would provide an accurate transcoder where semantic is taking into consideration.

As per claim 2, Smith et al teach receiving at least one semantic characteristic preference from the client... automatically converted based on the at least one semantic characteristic preference"(figure 1, his client preference, a policy engine gathers the capabilities of the client and the Transcoding preference of the user and publisher, Section 2, His Internet Content Transcoder III-599, see also Motoyama's system that use different resources for translating different portion of the document).

As per claim 7 and 8, wherein the semantic characteristic is the conformance with specified governmental regulations (his policy engine, page III-601, the trasncoding proxies generates and selects versions of the content according to policies (governmental regulations))

As per claim 9 and 10 wherein the semantic characteristic preference specified by the client is conformance with specified content filtering in the requested document (figure 1, His Internet Content Transcoder in particular his content filtering, pages III-600 and III-601)

As per claim 1 I and 12, Smith et al teach wherein the semantic characteristic specified by the client is the natural language requested document (figure 1, His Internet Content Transcoder in particular section 3.1, his translation and summarization, pages III-600 and III-601)

As per claims 13 and 14, Smith et al teach comparing the at lest one semantic characteristic preference received from the client with semantic conversion features supported by the transcoder processing system

(section 4, His Transcoding system in particular section 4.1 his policy engine, III-601).

5. Claims 3-4 and 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al (Transcoding Internet Content For Heterogeneous Client Devices) in view of Motoyama et al (5,848,3860) as applied to claim 2 above and further in view of Yamauchi et al (5,701,497)

As per claims 3 and 4, the combination of Smith with Motoyama teaches the semantic characteristic preference specified by the user (his transcoding preference of the user) but does not explicitly teach semantic characteristic preference specified by a client is readability level of the requested document". However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by Yamauchi et al who teach in figure 10-12, users sent document to the translator to be translated with their respective level of understanding of the language and the translator chose a dictionary accordingly. Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have it obvious to incorporate into the transcoder combination of Smith with Motoyama a user administration table where translation is done according to user's understanding level as taught by Yamauchi et al because it would facilitate to the user to obtain a translated document in a level that he can understand.

As per claims 5 and 6, the combination of Smith With Motoyama teaches the semantic characteristic preference specified by the user (his transcoding preference of the user) and further teaches semantic characteristic preference specified by a client is locale (see Motoyama; the various dictionaries English-Japanese used in his translation system for depending on a locale)

6. Claims 15-38 are the same in scope and content as claims 1-15 above and therefore are rejected under the same rationale.


7. Any response to this action should be mailed to:
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231 or faxed to:
(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)
Or:
(703) 305-9508 (for informal or draft communications, please
label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")
Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 11,
2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA. Sixth Floor (Receptionist).
6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or
earlier communications from the examiner should be
directed to Patrick N. Edouard whose telephone number
is (703) 308-6725. The examiner can normally be
reached on Tuesday-Friday from 07:30 a.m.-6:00 p.m.
If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are
unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond
Dorvil, can be reached on (703) 305-9645
The facsimile phone number for this Art Unit is (703)
872-9314. Alternatively, facsimile messages may be
sent directly to (703) 305-9644 where they will be
stored in the examiner's voice mailbox (telling the

examiner that a fax was received) and be automatically printed (i.e. - no delay by the examiner).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Patrick N. Edouard

April 7, 2004



PATRICK N. EDOUARD
PATENT EXAMINER